Effect of non-Markovianity on the dynamics of coherence, concurrence and Fisher information

Samyadeb Bhattacharya[1] *, Subhashish Banerjee[2] †, Arun Kumar Pati[1] ‡
[1] *Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhunsi, Allahabad - 211019, India*
and
[2] *Indian Institute of Technology Rajasthan, Jodhpur, India*

arXiv:1601.04742v1 [quant-ph] 15 Jan 2016

A master equation has been constructed for a global system-bath interaction both in the absence as well as presence of non-Markovian noise. The master equation has been exactly solved for a special class of two qubit X states (which contains Bell diagonal and Werner states). The l_1 norm of coherence has been calculated to observe the dynamics of quantum coherence in the presence of a global system-bath interaction. We show that the global part of the system-bath interaction compensates for the decoherence, resulting in the slow down of coherence decay. The concurrence and the Fisher information, explicitly calculated for a particular two qubit Werner state, indicate that the decay of these quantum features also slow down under a global system-bath interaction. We also show that the coherence is the most robust of all the three non-classical features under environmental interaction. Entanglement is shown to be the most costly of them all. For an appropriately defined limiting case, all the three quantities show freezing behaviour. This limiting condition is attainable when the separations between the energy levels of both the atomic qubits are small.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.67.Mn

I. INTRODUCTION

The main objective of the theory of open quantum systems is to develop a comprehensive description of various kind of interactions of the system with its ambient environment and their effect on the dynamics of the system of interest [1, 2]. Any realistic quantum system is bound to get affected by its environment and therefore the dynamical features of open quantum systems are particularly important from the practical perspective. Due to the advent of quantum technologies such as quantum communication [3–5], quantum cryptography [6, 7], there has been an upsurge of interest in the application of several techniques of open quantum systems. Markovian dynamics of open systems have been extensively studied and implemented successfully in a wide variety of problems [1, 8–12].

However, due to impressive developments in the experimentation with quantum systems and their control [13], it has been realized that open quantum systems do not generally behave within the domain of Markovian dynamics [14, 15]. Particularly for the case of systems constituting more than one interacting systems, where the interactions between the parties may be comparable to the interaction strength of the coupling to the bath, it is natural for the dynamics to deviate from Markovian behavior [16]. A number of measures of this deviation from Markovianity have been proposed recently, where "Non-Markovianity" is recognized as the departure from monotonic behavior of certain measures under strictly Markovian dynamics [17–22]. Generally, a quantitative measure, which shows monotonic behavior under Markovian dynamics is addressed and departure from that monotonicity is taken to be a signature of non-Markovianity. For example, we can consider the dynamics of entanglement in an open system scenario. Since local trace preserving completely positive maps do not increase the amount of entanglement, evidently it can be surmised that the entanglement with an ancillary system decays monotonically within Markovian regime. Thus, for example, in Ref. [20] the dynamics of entanglement was used as a signature to identify the non-Markovian characteristics of a system-environment interaction.

In recent times, the theory of quantum coherence as a resource has attracted much attention [23–30]. Coherence plays a central role in quantum mechanics enabling operations or tasks which are impossible within the regime of classical mechanics. Coherence underlies the non-classical behavior of a quantum system, like entanglement. In Ref. [23] several measures, like the l_1 norm and the relative entropy were introduced to char-

*sbh.phys@gmail.com
†subhashish@iitj.ac.in
‡akpati@hri.res.in

acterize the coherence of a quantum system. The valid measures of coherence should not increase under allowed incoherent operations. Based on this, it can be inferred that the measures of quantum coherence are monotone under Markovian dynamics. Hence any deviation from the montonicity of coherence measure can also be taken as a signature of deviation from Markovian dynamics [31, 32]. The central theme of our work revolves around this specific issue of the dynamical behavior of coherence monotones under a specific system-environment interaction which is not strictly Markovian. Usually for the case of Markovian dynamics of a composite system, the environment acts locally on each of the parties. For the bipartite case, considered here, the environment is globally interacting with the system. This enables us to consider two parts of the non-unitary evolution. One is of course the local Lindbladian and the other is an interactive part which is essentially causing the deviation from Markovian evolution. Here we have taken a two qubit atomic system interacting with a Harmonic oscillator bath. A similar model with a squeezed thermal bath has been studied earlier for estimating the entanglement dynamics of the atomic system [33, 34]. Based on the above mentioned model, the first part of our work is to present an analytical estimation of the dynamics of coherence, for the purpose of characterization of the deviation from monotonicity and to find the conditions under which such deviation occurs. After that we will extend our study to calculate the exact expression of concurrence for a special class of two qubit X states in order to observe the dynamics of entanglement in our proposed system-bath interaction.

Next, we consider the dynamics of quantum Fisher information. The Fisher information is a measure of intrinsic accuracy in statistical ensemble theory [35, 36]. Quantum generalization of the Fisher information has also been introduced [37, 38], which can be considered as a measure of non-classicality for quantum system [39, 40]. We establish a direct relation between quantum Fisher information and coherence in the system for a special class of two qubit density matrices. This is expected because non-classicality of a quantum system must be directly related to its inherent coherence. We will also study the dynamics of the Fisher information, indicating the effect of the interactive part of the non-unitary evolution. A comparison between the dynamics of coherence, entanglement and Fisher information will be made in order to find which is more sensitive to non-Markovian dynamics in the given scenario. Then, we will extend our study by considering the memory effect of environmental interaction. We will use a non-Markovian noise model to generalize the global master equation for memory dependent system-bath interactions. We will also solve the master equation for two qubit X states and obtain analytical expressions for the l_1 norm of coherence, concurrence and the Fisher information. Further, we will investigate the dynamics of the above mentioned measures for such type of interactions.

The organisation of the paper is as follows. In Section II, we will construct the master equation of the concerned system and obtain analytical solution for a particular class of density matrices. In Sections III and IV, we discuss the dynamics of quantum coherence, concurrence and quantum Fisher information, respectively. In Section V we generalize the master equation to incorporate memory dependent environmental interactions. We then present our conclusions in Section VI.

II. DYNAMICS OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTION WITH A COMPOSITE QUANTUM SYSTEM

The dynamics of the reduced density matrix of the system of interest, undergoing a completely positive (CP) evolution, can be expressed in terms of the Kraus operator sum representation (OSR) as

$$\rho(t) = \sum_i M_i(t)\rho(0)M_i^\dagger(t). \tag{2.1}$$

The Kraus operators M_i must satisfy the trace preserving condition, i.e.,

$$\sum_i M_i^\dagger(t)M_i(t) = \mathbb{I}. \tag{2.2}$$

The Kraus operator sum representation **governs** a CP evolution. The Markovian master equation can be constructed from the Kraus representation [41]. For a small time interval δt, if we consider

$$\begin{aligned} M_i(t) &\approx \sqrt{\delta t}L_i, \qquad \forall\ i \neq 0 \\ M_0(t) &\approx \mathbb{I} - \tfrac{\delta t}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i\neq 0} L_i^\dagger L_i, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

then it can be seen from equation (2.1), that

$$\frac{\rho(t)-\rho(0)}{\delta t} = \sum_i \left[L_i\rho L_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\left(L_i^\dagger L_i\rho + \rho L_i^\dagger L_i\right)\right]. \tag{2.4}$$

Now if we consider $L_i = \sqrt{\gamma_i}A_i$, then for $\delta t \to 0$, we get the differential equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \sum_i \gamma_i \left[A_i\rho A_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\left(A_i^\dagger A_i\rho + \rho A_i^\dagger A_i\right)\right], \tag{2.5}$$

where γ_is are the decay parameters. This is basically the usual Markovian master equation. Following Ref. [42], for a fixed operator basis $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha=0}^n$, with $A_0 = \mathbb{I}$, we can define $L_i = \sum_{\alpha=0}^n b_{i\alpha}A_\alpha$. Using equation (2.3), it can be seen that the master equation becomes

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \gamma_{\alpha\beta} \left[A_\alpha\rho A_\beta^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\left(A_\alpha^\dagger A_\beta\rho + \rho A_\alpha^\dagger A_\beta\right)\right], \tag{2.6}$$

where $\{\gamma_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_i b_{i\alpha} b^*_{i\beta}\}$ represents a coefficient matrix, called as the damping basis. The positivity of this kind of dynamical map depends on the positivity of the $\{\gamma_{\alpha\beta}\}$ matrix [42]. If all the eigenvalues of the damping basis matrix are positive, then the map is also positive.

Here we are dealing with a two qubit atomic system. Let us first begin by writing down the master equation for such systems, which is of the form (2.5)

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \sum_{i=1,2} \gamma_i (N+1) \left(\sigma_i^- \rho \sigma_i^+ - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma_i^+ \sigma_i^- \rho + \rho \sigma_i^+ \sigma_i^- \right) \right) + \sum_{i=1,2} \gamma_i N \left(\sigma_i^+ \rho \sigma_i^- - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma_i^- \sigma_i^+ \rho + \rho \sigma_i^- \sigma_i^+ \right) \right), \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$N = \frac{1}{\exp(\frac{\hbar\omega}{k_B T}) - 1}, \tag{2.8}$$

is the Planck distribution function and

$$\begin{array}{l} \sigma_1^- = \sigma^- \otimes \mathbb{I} \ ; \ \ \sigma_1^+ = \sigma^+ \otimes \mathbb{I}, \\ \sigma_2^- = \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma^- \ ; \ \ \sigma_2^+ = \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma^+, \end{array} \tag{2.9}$$

are the dipole lowering and raising operators acting locally on the two parties.
Let us now generalize this master equation for the two qubit system following [33], with the environment, modelling a thermal radiation field, interacting in a global way. This is achieved by a coupling dependent upon the qubit position $\mathbf{r_n}$. The effective Hamiltonian of the two qubit system can be expressed as

$$H_S = \sum_{n=1,2} \hbar \omega_n \sigma_n^z + H_{int}, \tag{2.10}$$

with

$$H_{int} = \hbar \left(\Omega_{12} e^{i\Phi} \sigma^- \otimes \sigma^+ + \Omega_{21} e^{-i\Phi} \sigma^+ \otimes \sigma^- \right) \tag{2.11}$$

where

$$\Omega_{ij} = \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{\gamma_i \gamma_j} \left[-(1 - (\hat{\mu}.\hat{r}_{ij})^2) \frac{\cos k_0 r_{ij}}{k_0 r_{ij}} + (1 - 3(\hat{\mu}.\hat{r}_{ij})^2) \left[\frac{\sin k_0 r_{ij}}{(k_0 r_{ij})^2} + \frac{\cos k_0 r_{ij}}{(k_0 r_{ij})^3} \right] \right]. \tag{2.12}$$

and Φ is an arbitrary phase introduced to generalize the interaction Hamiltonian. Here $\hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}_1 = \hat{\mu}_2$ are the dipole moment operators and $\hat{r_{ij}}$ are the unit vectors along the atomic transition dipole moments with $\mathbf{r_{ij}} = \mathbf{r_i} - \mathbf{r_j}$. Also $k_0 = \omega_0/c$, where $\omega_0 = (\omega_1 + \omega_2)/2$ and $\gamma_i = \omega_i^3 \mu_i^2 / 3\pi\varepsilon\hbar c^3$ is the spontaneous emission rate. Following Ref. [33], the non-unitary part of the global master equation can be written as

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \sum_{i,j=1,2} \gamma_{ij} (N+1) \left(\sigma_i^- \rho \sigma_j^+ - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^- \rho + \rho \sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^- \right) \right) + \sum_{i,j=1,2} \gamma_{ij} N \left(\sigma_i^+ \rho \sigma_j^- - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma_i^- \sigma_j^+ \rho + \rho \sigma_i^- \sigma_j^+ \right) \right), \tag{2.13}$$

where

with

$$\begin{array}{l} \gamma_{ij} = \sqrt{\gamma_i \gamma_j} a(k_0 r_{ij}) \ ; \quad \forall i \neq j \\ \gamma_i = \frac{\omega_i^3 \mu_i^2}{3\pi\varepsilon\hbar c^3}, \end{array} \tag{2.14}$$

$$a(k_0 r_{ij}) = \frac{3}{2}\left[(1-(\hat{\mu}.\hat{r}_{ij})^2)\frac{\sin k_0 r_{ij}}{k_0 r_{ij}} + (1-3(\hat{\mu}.\hat{r}_{ij})^2)\left[\frac{\cos k_0 r_{ij}}{(k_0 r_{ij})^2} - \frac{\sin k_0 r_{ij}}{(k_0 r_{ij})^3}\right]\right]. \tag{2.15}$$

Note that, γ_{ij} arises due to multi qubit interaction of the composite system with the bath and is the reason behind the global nature of the system-bath interaction. It should be noted that Ω_{ij} and $a(k_0 r_{ij})$ are responsible for the coherent and incoherent parts of the evolution of the system of interest, respectively. Basically, the bath opens up a channel between the two system qubits, an aspect of global interaction not seen for local interactions.

For a two qubit system with identical parties we have $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma$. Also, $k_0 = 2\pi/\lambda_0$ is the resonant wave vector, and occurring in the term $k_0 r_{ij}$ indicates a resonant length scale. Now the damping basis matrix for the equation (2.13) will be

$$\begin{pmatrix} \gamma(N+1) & 0 & \gamma_{12}(N+1) & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma N & 0 & \gamma_{12} N \\ \gamma_{12}(N+1) & 0 & \gamma(N+1) & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_{12} N & 0 & \gamma N \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.16}$$

From (2.16), we see that the condition for positivity is $\gamma_{12} \leq \gamma$, that is, $a(k_0 r_{ij}) \leq 1$ (for the rest of the paper we will denote it by a). Using (2.15), we find the specific condition for positivity as

$$R \sin^2\phi \frac{\sin(k_0 r_{ij} - \theta)}{k_0 r_{ij}} \leq \frac{2}{3}, \tag{2.17}$$

with

$$R = \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{2\cot^2\phi - 1}{(k_0 r_{ij})^2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{2\cot^2\phi - 1}{k_0 r_{ij}}\right)^2}, \tag{2.18}$$

and

$$\tan\theta = \frac{2\cot^2\phi - 1}{k_o r_{ij} + \frac{2\cot^2\phi - 1}{k_0 r_{ij}}}. \tag{2.19}$$

For a specific case, we can take $\cot\phi = 1/\sqrt{2}$, so that $\tan\theta = 0$ and $R = 1$. For this case, the condition of positivity reduces to

$$\frac{\sin k_0 r_{ij}}{k_0 r_{ij}} \leq 1. \tag{2.20}$$

From (2.20), it is evident that the limiting condition $(a \to 1)$ can be reached, when the separation (r_{ij}) is very small compared to the resonant wavelength λ_0. This is attainable when λ_0 is very large, i.e., the separation between the energy levels of both the atomic qubits is small. Our aim here is to find a solution for the master equation given by (2.13). For that purpose we take a special class of density matrices of the form of X-states

$$\begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{14} \\ 0 & \rho_{22} & \rho_{23} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{23}^* & \rho_{22} & 0 \\ \rho_{14}^* & 0 & 0 & \rho_{11} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.21}$$

X states are very important in the study of quantum information theory because of their simple representation [43, 44]. Inserting (2.21) in (2.13), we get the following set of coupled differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_{11} &= -\gamma(2N+1)\rho_{11} + \gamma(2N+1)\rho_{22} + \gamma_{12}(2N+1)\tfrac{\rho_{23}+\rho_{32}}{2}, \\ \dot{\rho}_{22} &= \gamma(2N+1)\rho_{11} - \gamma(2N+1)\rho_{22} - \gamma_{12}(2N+1)\tfrac{\rho_{23}+\rho_{32}}{2}, \\ \dot{\rho}_{23} &= -\gamma(2N+1)\rho_{23} - \gamma_{12}(2N+1)\rho_{22} + \gamma_{12}(2N+1)\rho_{11}, \\ \dot{\rho}_{14} &= -\gamma(2N+1)\rho_{14}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

The solution of these equations are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{11}(t) = &\left(\tfrac{\rho_{11}(0)+\rho_{22}(0)}{2}\right) + \left(\tfrac{\rho_{11}(0)-\rho_{22}(0)}{2\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right) e^{-\frac{3\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}} \left[\sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\tfrac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) - \sinh\left(\tfrac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] \\ &+ \tfrac{a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\zeta(0) e^{-\frac{3\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}} \sinh\left(\tfrac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{22}(t) = &\left(\tfrac{\rho_{11}(0)+\rho_{22}(0)}{2}\right) - \left(\tfrac{\rho_{11}(0)-\rho_{22}(0)}{2\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right) e^{-\frac{3(2N+1)\gamma t}{2}} \left[\sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\tfrac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) - \sinh\left(\tfrac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] \\ &- \tfrac{a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\zeta(0) e^{-\frac{3\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}} \sinh\left(\tfrac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

$$\rho_{23}(t) = \frac{\zeta(0)}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}} e^{-\frac{3\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}} \left[\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] + \frac{a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}(\rho_{11}(0)-\rho_{22}(0)) e^{-\frac{3\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}} \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \bar{\zeta}(0) e^{-\gamma(2N+1)t}, \tag{2.25}$$

$$\rho_{14}(t) = \rho_{14}(0)\exp\left(-\gamma(2N+1)t\right), \tag{2.26}$$

where $\zeta(0) = (\rho_{23}(0)+\rho_{23}^*(0))/2$ and $\bar{\zeta}(0) = (\rho_{23}(0)-\rho_{23}^*(0))/2$. From Eq. (2.25), we can clearly see that, due to the presence of global system-environment interaction (whose strength is characterized by a), the off-diagonal components are getting feedback from the diagonal parts and is unlike that of Markovian decay. If we approximate that the interactive part of the evolution is negligible, then setting $a \to 0$, we get

$$\rho_{23}(t) = \rho_{23}(0)\exp(-\gamma(2N+1)t), \tag{2.27}$$

which is consistent with the usual Markovian decay.

III. DYNAMICS OF COHERENCE AND ENTANGLEMENT

Coherence is one of the fundamental properties of a quantum system closely connected to quantum superposition. Though quantum optics was the initial framework for understanding the concept and physical significance of coherence [45, 46], over the years its importance has been realized in many different fields, such as superconducting devices [47] and even in complex biological systems like photosynthetic reaction centers [48, 49]. Coherence is also very important from the perspective of quantum thermodynamics [50–54]. In non-equilibrium situations, presence of coherence raises serious questions over the classical notion of a thermodynamic bath in a Carnot engine [55, 56]. It has impact on quantum transport efficiency [57–59], leading to the violation of Fourier's Law [60]. Dissipative quantum thermodynamics offers the possibility to generate resources which are essential for technologies like quantum communication, cryptography, metrology and computation [61]. From these perspectives, it is very important to understand the role of quantum coherence for the future development of robust quantum memory devices. All these recent developments provided the motivation for constructing a rigorous framework of coherence resource theory [23], where it was shown that any valid measure of coherence $C(\rho)$ has the following properties:

1. $C(\rho) = 0$ iff $\rho \in \mathcal{I}$, where $\mathcal{I}$ denotes incoherent states, which are the diagonal states in the preferred basis.

2. Monotonicity under incoherent selective measurements : $C(\rho) \geq \sum_n p_n C(\rho_n)$. Here $\rho_n = \hat{\mathcal{K}}_n \rho \hat{\mathcal{K}}_n^\dagger$ and $p_n = Tr(\hat{\mathcal{K}}_n \rho \hat{\mathcal{K}}_n^\dagger)$ with $\sum_n \hat{\mathcal{K}}_n^\dagger \hat{\mathcal{K}}_n = \mathbb{I}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_n \mathcal{I} \hat{\mathcal{K}}_n^\dagger \subset \mathcal{I}$.

3. Convexity : $C(\sum_n p_n \rho_n) \leq \sum_n p_n C(\rho_n)$ for any set of states $\{\rho_n\}$ and probability distribution $\{P_n\}$.

Based on these properties, the 'l_1 norm of coherence' and the 'relative entropy of coherence' were shown to be valid measures characterizing the coherence of a quantum system [23]. Here, we will take the l_1 norm of coherence $C_{l_1}(\rho)$ to study the dynamics of coherence. It is an intuitive measure related to the off-diagonal elements of a density matrix and is defined as the l_1 matrix norm $C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_{i\neq j} \|\rho_{ij} - \mathcal{I}_{ij}\|$. After doing the optimization over all possible incoherent states ($\mathcal{I}$), it can be shown to be

$$C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_{i\neq j} |\langle i|\rho|j\rangle|, \tag{3.1}$$

that is, the sum of the magnitudes of all the off-diagonal elements. Interestingly, it is important to note that the l_1-norm of coherence truly captures the notion of wave nature as it satisfies a duality relation [62]. Also it can be addressed that the notion of quantum coherence played a prominent role in a recent study devoted to the understanding of neutrino oscillations [63]. For our case, we find the l_1 norm of coherence to be

$$C_{l_1}(\rho) = 2|\rho_{14}(0)|\exp(-\gamma(2N+1)t) + 2\left|\begin{array}{l} \frac{\zeta(0)}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}} e^{-\frac{3\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}} \left[\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] \\ + \frac{2a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}(\rho_{11}(0)-\rho_{22}(0)) e^{-\frac{3\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}} \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \bar{\zeta}(0) e^{-\gamma(2N+1)t} \end{array}\right|. \tag{3.2}$$

For example, let us take a particular Werner state

$$\frac{1}{4}\begin{pmatrix} 1-x & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x+1 & -2x & 0 \\ 0 & -2x & x+1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-x \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.3}$$

where x is a non-zero parameter lying between $-1/3$ and 1. For these particular states, the l_1 norm of coherence is given by Eq. (3.4). Here the coherence defined in the usual computational basis ($|\ 00\rangle$, $|\ 01\rangle$, $|\ 10\rangle$, $|\ 11\rangle$), is given by

$$C_{L1}(\rho_W) = |x|e^{-\frac{3\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \left(\frac{1+2a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right)\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right]. \tag{3.4}$$



FIG. 1: (Colour online) Coherence C with respect to γt for the Werner state with $x = 1/2$, with a as a parameter. We have taken $a = 0, 1/2, 3/4, 1$ respectively. The red (large dashed) plot is for $a = 0$, which is the usual Markovian case. The blue (thin line) plot is for $a = 1/2$, while black (small dashed) and green (thick line) denote $a = 3/4$ and $a = 1$, respectively. The figure shows that with increment of a, the decay of coherence slows down and for the limiting case, it freezes after some time. The increment of coherence is the signature of the deviation from Markovian behavior.

In Fig.1, the evolution of C_{l_1} with time (scaled by the decay parameter γ) is depicted. It can be seen that with the increment of the strength of the non-local environmental interaction, the decay of coherence slows down. For the limiting case of $a = 1$, the l_1 norm of coherence is constant and equals to $C_{l_1} = |x|$. This limiting condition is attainable when the separation between the energy levels of both the atomic qubits is small. Whereas, for the local Markovian case we have $C_{l_1} = |x|e^{-\gamma t(2N+1)}$. Hence it is clear, that the global part of the environmental interaction imposes a reverse flow of coherence into the system as opposed to the usual Markovian decay. Due to this reverse flow, the usual decoherence process slows down and may even stop, depending on the strength of the global interaction. The global interaction therefore generates a feedback to coherence at the expense of the population. In a recent work [64], a dynamical condition has been proposed, under which the coherence of qubit systems is totally unaffected by noise. There the dynamical process under which the qubit system evolves is considered to be incoherent; that is, the process maps any incoherent state to the set of incoherent states. From the perspective of coherence resource theory, what we are claiming here is different from the motivation of that work. Here, we have taken a dynamical map, which acts as a resource for generating quantum coherence in a qubit system. Next, we will consider the dynamics of other quantum correlations like the entanglement and the Fisher information to further extend our study.

Let us now compare the dynamics of the coherence with that of the entanglement, expressed as the concurrence [65, 66]. Entanglement is a very basic property of a composite quantum system, which gives rise to nontrivial phenomena in quantum information science. It is well known that many composite quantum systems having coherence (even some maximally coherent states) may not be entangled at all. For example, the maximally coherent state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle + |11\rangle)$ can be written in the form $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$, that is, the state is a product state and hence not entangled. This indicates that entanglement is a much more restricted quantum characteristic than coherence. We will now study the dynamics of concurrence for the global environmental interaction, to see whether it has a similar effect on entanglement as it had on coherence.

For any two qubit system, concurrence may be explicitly calculated from the density matrix as

$$E_c(\rho) = max\{0, \sqrt{\lambda_1} - \sqrt{\lambda_2} - \sqrt{\lambda_3} - \sqrt{\lambda_4}\}, \tag{3.5}$$

where the quantities λ_i (i=1,2,3,4) are the eigenvalues of the matrix (in decreasing order)

$$\tau = \rho(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\rho^*(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y). \tag{3.6}$$

Here ρ^* is the complex conjugate of the density matrix ρ in the usual computational basis. For the X states we have taken in (2.21), the concurrence can be expressed in a simpler form as given by

$$E_c = max\{0, (|\rho_{23}| - \sqrt{\rho_{11}\rho_{44}}), (|\rho_{14}| - \sqrt{\rho_{22}\rho_{33}})\}. \tag{3.7}$$

For the case of Werner states (3.3), the concurrence will be $E_c = max\{0, |\rho_{23}| - \sqrt{\rho_{11}\rho_{44}}\}$. Hence, when $|\rho_{23}| > \sqrt{\rho_{11}\rho_{44}}$, the state is entangled. For the Werner states, we get

$$E_c(\rho_W) = \frac{|x|}{2}e^{-\frac{3\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \left(\frac{1+2a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right)\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] + \frac{x}{4}e^{-\frac{3\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \left(\frac{2a-1}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right)\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] - \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.8}$$



FIG. 2: (Colour online) Concurrence E_C versus γt for the Werner state with $x = 1/2$, with a as a parameter. We have taken $a = 0, 1/2, 3/4, 1$ respectively. The red (large dashed) plot is for $a = 0$, which is the usual Markovian case. The blue (thin line) plot is for $a = 1/2$, black (small dashed) plot is for $a = 3/4$ and green (thick line) is for $a = 1$. The figure shows that with increment of a, the sudden death of entanglement slows down, like a slow decay. For $a = 1$, the sudden death vanishes completely and entanglement freezes to a particular value after a small initial decay.

From the Fig.2, we see that entanglement decay also slows down with the increase in the strength of the global environmental interaction. For the limiting value $a = 1$, after some initial decay, it also saturates like coherence. In this section, we have shown that the global system-bath interaction prolongs the lifetime of coherence and entanglement. With the increasing strength of the global part of the interaction (which is characterized by the parameter a), the lifetime of both the coherence and the entanglement increases. But we will show in the next section that the entanglement is much more vulnerable to environmental interaction than the coherence, as well as the Fisher information.

IV. DYNAMICS OF FISHER INFORMATION

The Fisher information has considerable significance in statistical estimation theory, as a measure of "intrinsic accuracy" [35]. A quantum generalization of the Fisher information was proposed in Refs. [37] and [38]. Here, we develop on the theme that the Fisher information can also be considered as a measure of non-classicality of a quantum system. It has been shown [39] that the Fisher information of a quantum observable is proportional to the difference between quantum variance and the classical variance of the conjugate variable. The Fisher information of a parameterized family of probability densities $\{p_\theta : \theta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ on $\mathbb{R}$, is defined as

$$F(p_\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}p_\theta^{1/2}(x)\right)^2 dx = \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log p_\theta^{1/2}(x)\right)^2 p_\theta dx. \tag{4.1}$$

Particularly, when $P_\theta(x) = p_\theta(x-\theta)$, then by translational invariance of the Lebesque integral, one can conclude that the Fisher information $F(p_\theta)$ is independent of θ. In that case the Fisher information can be denoted as $F(p)$ [67]. A natural generalization of the Fisher information [67, 68] arises from (4.1), when we consider

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}p_\theta = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log p_\theta . p_\theta + p_\theta . \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log p_\theta\right). \tag{4.2}$$

By replacing the integration by trace, probability p_θ by density matrix ρ_θ and **the** logarithmic derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log p_\theta$ by **the** symmetric logarithmic derivative L_θ, determined by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\rho_\theta = \frac{1}{2}(L_\theta\rho_\theta + \rho_\theta L_\theta), \qquad \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.3}$$

the Fisher information can be expressed as [67]

$$F(p_\theta) = \frac{1}{4}Tr(L_\theta^2\rho_\theta). \tag{4.4}$$

Now, if it is independent of the parameter θ, it can be shown that $F(\rho, H) = \frac{1}{4}Tr(\rho L^2)$ [67], where $i(\rho H - H\rho) = \frac{1}{2}(L\rho + \rho L)$. After some algebra, the Fisher information of an operator H can be shown to be

$$F(\rho, H) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m,n}\frac{(\lambda_m - \lambda_n)^2}{\lambda_m + \lambda_n}|\langle\psi_m|H|\psi_n\rangle|^2, \tag{4.5}$$

where λ_m and $|\psi_m\rangle$ are the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the density matrix, respectively. It is to be noted

that, if H commutes with ρ, then the Fisher information $F(\rho, H)$ becomes zero. Hence, we will have non-zero Fisher information for an observable only when it is skewed or non-commuting with the density matrix. In Ref. [39], it was shown that, in the Schrödinger picture, the position Fisher information is equal to the square of the variance of the non-classical part of the conjugate momentum with a factor $4/\hbar^2$. This means that the Fisher information gives us a certain quantification of non-classicality or quantumness of a system. Hence the dynamics of Fisher information would be related to the dynamics of non-classicality associated with a quantum system. Here we are interested in the Fisher information of the correlation in the composite system. From Eq. (2.10) and Eq. (2.11), expressing the system Hamiltonian, we find that the correlation of the system is driven by the interaction Hamiltonian H_{int}. Hence, it would be a reasonable assumption, if we consider the Fisher information of the operator $A_{int} = (\sigma^- \otimes \sigma^+ e^{i\Phi} + \sigma^+ \otimes \sigma^- e^{-i\Phi})$ as a measure of non-classicality of the composite system. For the density matrix given by (2.21), we find that

$$F\left(A_{int}, \rho\right) = \frac{2|\rho_{23}(t)|^2}{\rho_{22}(t)} \sin^2 \Phi. \tag{4.6}$$

From this expression, we can see that the non-classicality of the system is directly related to the coherence of the system. Now, we consider **the** Werner states of the form $\frac{(1-x)}{4}\mathbb{I} + x|\psi^-\rangle\langle\psi^-|$, where $|\psi^-\rangle = (|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$.

Using equation (4.5) for the above mentioned class of states, the Fisher information can be shown to be

$$F\left(A_{int}, \rho_W\right) = \frac{2\sin^2\Phi|x|^2 e^{-3\gamma t(2N+1)}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \left(\frac{1+2a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right)\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right]^2}{1 - x\frac{e^{-3\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)}}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\left[\sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) - (1-2a)\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right]}. \tag{4.7}$$

Like coherence and entanglement, in Fig. 3, the dynamics of Fisher information with time is depicted for different values of a. Here we have taken the phase in the interaction Hamiltonian (Φ) to be $\pi/4$. It can be seen that similar to coherence and entanglement, the decay of Fisher information also slows down with increment of a and for the limiting case $a \to 1$, it saturates.



FIG. 3: (Colour online) Fisher information F_W as a function of γt. For the Werner state with $x = 1/2$, with a as a parameter. We have taken $a = 0, 1/2, 3/4, 1$ respectively. The red (large dashed) plot is for $a = 0$, which is the usual Markovian case. The blue (thin line) plot is for $a = 1/2$, black (small dashed) plot is for $a = 3/4$ and green (thick line) is for $a = 1$. The figure shows that with increment of a, the decay of Fisher information slows down and for the limiting value of $a = 1$, it saturates.

From the dynamical behavior of coherence, entanglement and Fisher information, we can now surmise that the decay of all these non-classical aspects of quantum correlations slow down and even freeze (for the limiting case) under the global environmental interaction. If we compare the dynamics of coherence, Fisher information and entanglement for a fixed value of a, we see that coherence is sustained for the longest period followed by Fisher information (see Fig. 4). Entanglement is the most vulnerable quantity under dissipative interaction and hence is most costly to preserve under such open dynamical scenario.

It is also important to note that not all states will show this behavior of coherence and correlation freezing. For example, Werner states of the form $\frac{(1-x)}{4}\mathbb{I} + x|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|$ with $|\psi^+\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, will not show the above observed behavior of slowing down of coherence and correlation decay. This could be attributed to the form of the coherent part of the effective Hamiltonian (2.10) and (2.11), due to the global nature of the system-reservoir interaction. Following Ref. [34], we can infer that under the evolution determined by the interaction Hamiltonian (2.11), the two atom system behaves as a single four level system with the ground state $|g\rangle$, the excited state $|e\rangle$ and two intermediate symmetric and anti-symmetric states $|s\rangle$ and $|as\rangle$, respectively. Where

$$\begin{aligned} |g\rangle &= |00\rangle,\ |e\rangle = |11\rangle, \\ |s\rangle &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle + |01\rangle), \\ |as\rangle &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle - |01\rangle). \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

The Hamiltonian (2.10), which is generated by dipole-



FIG. 4: (Colour online) Concurrence $E_C/E_C(0)$, Fisher information $F_W/F_W(0)$ and coherence $C/C(0)$ with respect to γt for the Werner state with $x = 1/2$, with a as a parameter. We have taken $a = 1/2$. Here we are normalizing all the measures by their magnitude at initial time $t = 0$. The red (large dashed) plot is for coherence, green (bold line) plot is for Fisher information and blue (small dashed) plot is for entanglement. We see here that entanglement decays fastest, followed by Fisher information. Coherence sustains for a much longer period.

dipole interactions [34], does not affect the ground and excited states. Only the symmetric and anti-symmetric states are affected by it. The incoherent part of the dipole-dipole interaction is basically the global part of the dynamical map with the strength γ_{12}. Therefore, the global interaction affects only ρ_{23} and ρ^*_{23}, which are the components of the symmetric and anti-symmetric states.

V. GLOBAL MASTER EQUATION WITH TIME VARYING PARAMETERS

In this section, we further generalize our global master equation by considering the memory effect of the bath. In a practical situation, an environment usually has memory. In an experiment, a composite quantum system can be exposed to various kind of noises such as vacuum noise, phase noise, thermal noise as well as a mixture of different kind of noises. Different noise models has been proposed in recent years to model solvable approximate master equations [69, 70]. Correlation dynamics in the Markovian (no memory) regime has been extensively studied [71]. However, in practice, an environment is more likely to be non-Markovian. A systematic investigation of the dynamics of quantum coherence and correlation in the presence of non-Markovian noise is an ongoing study. Here we use a model studied in Ref. [72], where entanglement dynamics was examined in a perturbative model of non-Markovian noise. Considering an entangled spin pair subjected to random frequency fluctuations [73], a Gaussian noise model was adopted, which is essentially non-Markovian, and has a well defined Markov limit. Following Ref. [72], we include this memory dependent noise model to propose a global master equation of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{d\rho}{dt} =& \\ &\textstyle\sum_{\alpha\beta} G_{\alpha\beta}(t)(N+1)\left(A_\alpha \rho A^\dagger_\beta - \tfrac{1}{2}\left(A^\dagger_\alpha A_\beta \rho + \rho A^\dagger_\alpha A_\beta\right)\right) \\ &+ \textstyle\sum_{\alpha\beta} G_{\alpha\beta}(t) N\left(A^\dagger_\alpha \rho A_\beta - \tfrac{1}{2}\left(A_\alpha A^\dagger_\beta \rho + \rho A_\alpha A^\dagger_\beta\right)\right),\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$G_{\alpha\beta}(t) = \gamma_{\alpha\beta}\left(1 - e^{-\Lambda t}\right). \tag{5.2}$$

The environmental memory information is encoded in the time dependent coefficient $G_{\alpha\beta}$, with $t_c = 1/\Lambda$ as the environmental memory characteristic time. $t_c \to 0$ is the Markov limit, for which $G_{\alpha\beta}(t) = \gamma_{\alpha\beta}$ at all times. Let us now consider a specific case of depolarizing channel, for which

$$A_1 = \sigma^- \otimes \mathbb{I} \quad ; \quad A_2 = \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma^-. \tag{5.3}$$

We intend to find an exact solution of the master equation for this particular case in order to study the dynamics of coherence and correlation for special kind of X states as described by equation (2.21). We once again take the initial state as the Werner state (3.3). This is basically an initial value problem of coupled first order ordinary differential equation (ODE) with variable coefficients. We know that they are not exactly solvable for all cases. But fortunately for our case, an analytical solution can be obtained. In a linear system of ODE such as $\dot{Y}(t) = A(t)Y(t)$, if the coefficient matrix commutes with itself for any two arguments, that is, if $A(t)A(s) = A(s)A(t)$ for all s and t, then we can write $B(t) = \int_0^t A(t')dt'$ and observe $B(t)A(s) = A(s)B(t)$. For this we have a formal solution of the coupled set of differential equations as $Y(t) = Y(0)\exp(B(t))$. By this procedure we can solve the master equation (5.1) exactly for the case of two qubit X states. The components of the density matrix can be expressed as

$$\rho_{11}(t) = \left(\frac{\rho_{11}(0)+\rho_{22}(0)}{2}\right) + \left(\frac{\rho_{11}(0)-\rho_{22}(0)}{2\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right) e^{-\frac{3\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}} \left[\sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) - \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] + \frac{a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\zeta(0)e^{-\frac{3\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}}\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right), \tag{5.4}$$

$$\rho_{22}(t) = \left(\frac{\rho_{11}(0)+\rho_{22}(0)}{2}\right) - \left(\frac{\rho_{11}(0)-\rho_{22}(0)}{2\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right) e^{-\frac{3(2N+1)\gamma\Theta t}{2}} \left[\sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) - \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] - \frac{a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\zeta(0)e^{-\frac{3\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}}\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right), \tag{5.5}$$

$$\rho_{23}(t) = \frac{\zeta(0)}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}e^{-\frac{3\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}}\left[\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] + \frac{a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}(\rho_{11}(0)-\rho_{22}(0))e^{-\frac{3\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}}\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}{2}\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \bar{\zeta}(0)e^{-\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t}, \tag{5.6}$$

$$\rho_{14}(t) = \rho_{14}(0)\exp\left(-\gamma\Theta(2N+1)t\right), \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$\Theta = 1 + \frac{1}{\Lambda t}(e^{-\Lambda t} - 1). \tag{5.8}$$

Using these solutions, the analytical expressions for the l_1 norm of coherence, **the** concurrence and **the** Fisher information (for $x = 1/2$) are given by

$$C_{l_1}(\rho_W) = \tfrac{1}{2}\exp\left(-\tfrac{3\gamma t}{2}\Theta(2N+1)\right)\left[\cosh\left(\tfrac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\Theta\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \left(\tfrac{1+2a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right)\sinh\left(\tfrac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\Theta\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right], \tag{5.9}$$

$$E_c(\rho_W) = \tfrac{1}{8}\exp\left(-\tfrac{3\gamma t}{2}\Theta(2N+1)\right)\left[3\cosh\left(\tfrac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\Theta\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \left(\tfrac{1+6a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right)\sinh\left(\tfrac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\Theta\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right] - \tfrac{1}{4}, \tag{5.10}$$

$$F(A_{int},\rho_W) = \frac{\frac{1}{4}e^{-3\gamma t\Theta(2N+1)}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\Theta\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) + \left(\frac{1+2a}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\right)\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\Theta\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right]^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2}\frac{e^{-3\frac{\gamma t}{2}\Theta(2N+1)}}{\sqrt{1+8a^2}}\left[\sqrt{1+8a^2}\cosh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\Theta\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right) - (1-2a)\sinh\left(\frac{\gamma t}{2}(2N+1)\Theta\sqrt{1+8a^2}\right)\right]}. \tag{5.11}$$

From Fig. 5, it is clear that the non-Markovian system-bath interaction also enhances the stabilization of coherence and correlations.

In Ref. [72] it was shown that the non-Markovian system environmental interaction can prolong the lifetime of entanglement. But they had considered the situation, where the bath is acting locally on each part of the system. Here we have extended it for global system-bath interaction. Furthermore, we observe that the global environmental interaction can also prolong the lifetime of entanglement, coherence and the Fisher information, showing similar features like the non-Markovian dynamics considered in Ref. [72].

VI. CONCLUSION

To conclude, in this work we exploit a useful global system-environment interaction and study the effect of non-Markovian behavior on various facets of quantum coherence and correlations. Here we have found that the global part of the environmental interaction is acting as a



FIG. 5: (Colour online)
Coherence C , Fisher information F_W, concurrence E_c versus γt and C, F, E_c with respect to γt (for a=1/2).
Here the dynamics of coherence, Fisher information, entanglement in presence of non-Markovian noise are shown. The first plot is for coherence, where we have plotted C for the $a = 0$ (red large dashed), 1/2 (blue thin line), 3/4 (black small dashed), 1 (green thick line), respectively. The second one depicts Fisher information F_W for the same values of a. Similarly, the third one is for concurrence E_c. The final plot makes a comparative study of all of them for $a = 1/2$, where C is given by red (large dashed) line, F_W by blue (small dashed) and E_c by green (thin) lines, respectively.

resource to compensate the decoherence effect. We have further extended our result to the case where the bath has memory by adopting a Gaussian non-Markovian noise model. We have given the exact solution of the proposed master equation for special two qubit X states, both in the presence and absence of non-Markovian noise. For both the cases, analytical expressions for the l_1 norm of coherence, concurrence and Fisher information have been calculated. We have shown that with increasing strength of the global part of the environmental interaction, both coherence and correlation (entanglement and Fisher information) decay slows down and for the limiting case they eventually freeze. The limiting condition is attainable when the separation between the energy levels of both the atomic qubits is small. Quantum coherence is seen to be most robust with respect to this global interaction followed by the Fisher information and then the entanglement. Entanglement is more restricted and sensitive among various measures quantifying the *quantumness* of a system, a notion compatible with physical intuition. This suggests that entanglement is the most costly of all the correlations. To summarize, in this work we have examined the emergence of non-Markovianity and its impact on the evolution of a number of facets of *quantumness* in the system. It is observed that non-Markovianity can play a nontrivial and useful role in various quantum information tasks where coherence and entanglement are considered as resources.

Acknowledgement

S. Bhattacharya thanks Uttam Singh, Avijit Misra and Titas Chanda of Harish-Chandra Research Institute (HRI) for useful discussions. S. Banerjee acknowledges the warm hospitality extended to him by the Quantum Information Group at HRI, where this work was initiated. S. Bhattacharya acknowledges the Department of Atomic Energy, Govt. of India for financial support.

[1] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007).
[2] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems*, (World Scientific,Singapore, 2000).
[3] X. S. Ma *et. al.*, Nature **489**, 269 (2012).
[4] J.I. Cirac, P. Zoller, J.H. Kimble, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett, **78**, 3221 (1997).
[5] D. Bouwmeester, J.W. Pan, K. Mattle et al., Nature, **390**, 575 (1997).
[6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, (Cambridge Univ. Press,Cambridge, 2000).
[7] Y. C. Liang, D. Kaszlikowski, B.-G. Englert, L. C. Kwek, and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022324 (2003).
[8] S. Banerjee and R. Srikanth, Eur. Phys. J. D **46**, 335 (2008); S. N. Sandhya and S. Banerjee, Euro. Phys. J. D: **66**, 168 (2012); S. Banerjee, C. M. Chandrashekar and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 042119 (2013).
[9] R. Srikanth and S. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012318 (2008).
[10] C. M. Chandrashekar, R. Srikanth and S. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 022316 (2007); S. Banerjee, R. Srikanth, C. M. Chandrashekar and Pranaw Rungta, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 052316 (2008); R. Srikanth, S. Banerjee and C. M. Chandrashekar, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062123 (2010).
[11] K. Thapliyal, S. Banerjee, A. Pathak, S. Omkar and V. Ravishankar, Ann. of Phys. **362**, 261 (2015).
[12] K. Thapliyal, S. Banerjee and A. Pathak, arXiv:1507.02135.
[13] S. Goyal, S. Banerjee and S. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. A: **85**, 012327 (2012).
[14] S. Banerjee and R. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 042105 (2000).
[15] S. Banerjee and R. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. E. **67**, 056120 (2003).
[16] A. Ishizaki and G. R. Fleming, J. Chem. Phys. **130**, 234110 (2009)
[17] M. M. Wolf *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 150402 (2008).
[18] H.P. Breuer *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).
[19] E.M. Laine *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062115 (2010).
[20] A. Rivas *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010).
[21] A. K. Rajagopal, A. R. Usha Devi and R. W. Rendell, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042107 (2010).
[22] H. P. Breuer, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **45**, 154001 (2012).

[23] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
[24] A. Winter and D. Yang, arXiv:1506.07975 (2015).
[25] A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020403 (2015).
[26] U. Singh, M. N. Bera, H. S. Dhar, and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **91** 052115 (2015).
[27] U. Singh, M.N. Bera, A. Misra and A.K. Pati, arXiv:1506.08186 (2015).
[28] E. Chitambar, A. Streltsov, S. Rana, M. N. Bera, G. Adesso and M. Lewenstein, arXiv:1507.08171 (2015).
[29] S. Rana, P. Parashar and M. Lewenstein, arXiv:1511.01854 (2015).
[30] A. Streltsov arXiv:1511.08346 (2015).
[31] T. Chanda and S. Bhattacharya, arXiv:1505.05810 (2015).
[32] N. Tang, W. Cheng and H-S. Zeng, Eur. Phys. J. D **68**, 278 (2014).
[33] S. Banerjee, V. Ravishankar and R. Srikanth, Annals of Physics **325**, 816 (2010).
[34] Z. Ficek and R. Tanas, Physics Reports **372**, 369 (2002).
[35] R. A. Fisher, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **22**, 700 (1925).
[36] C. R. Rao, Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society **37**, 81 (1945).
[37] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory*, (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
[38] A. S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982), Chapter VI.
[39] M. J. W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **62** 012107, (2000).
[40] S. Banerjee, A. K. Alok and S. Omkar, arXiv:1511.03029 (2015).
[41] J. Preskill, *Quantum Information and Computation*, Lecture Notes for Physics Vol. 229 (Springer, Berlin, 1998).
[42] D. A. Lider *et.al.*, Chem. Phys. **268**, 35 (2001).
[43] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Quantum Inform. Comput. **7**, 459 (2007).
[44] A. R. P. Rau, J. Phys. A **42**, 412002 (2009).
[45] R. J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. **131**, 2766 (1963).
[46] E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 277 (1963).
[47] J. Almeida, P. C. de Groot, S. F. Huelga, A. M. Liguori, and M. B. Plenio, J. Phys. B: At. Mol.Opt. Phys. **46**, 104002 (2013).
[48] S. Lloyd, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **302**, 012037 (2011).
[49] E. Romero, R. Augulis, V. I. Novoderezhkin, M. Ferretti, J. Thieme, D. Zigmantas, and R. V. Grondelle, Nature Phys. **10**, 676 (2014).
[50] P. Rebentrost, M. Mohseni, I. Kassal, S. Lloyd, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, New Journal of Physics **11**, 033003 (2009).
[51] D. Manzano, M. Tiersch, A. Asadian, and H. J. Briegel, Physical Review E **86**, 061118 (2012).
[52] D. Kondepudi and I. Prigogine, Modern Thermodynamics (John Wiley and Sons Ltd, Sussex, England, 1998).
[53] H. Spohn, Journal of Mathematical Physics **19**, 1227 (1978).
[54] F. G. S. L. Brandao, N. H. Y. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner, arXiv:1305.5278 (2013).
[55] M. Scully, M. Zubairy, G. S. Agarwal, and H. Walther, Science **299**, 862 (2003).
[56] M. O. Scully, Physical Review Letters **104**, 207701 (2010).
[57] M. Mohseni, P. Rebentrost, S. Lloyd, and A. AspuruGuzik, The Journal of Chemical Physics **129**, 174106 (2008).
[58] M. B. Plenio and S. F. Huelga, New Journal of Physics **10**, 113019 (2008).
[59] P. Rebentrost, M. Mohseni, I. Kassal, S. Lloyd, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, New Journal of Physics **11**, 033003 (2009).
[60] D. Manzano, M. Tiersch, A. Asadian, and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. E **86**, 061118 (2012).
[61] Y. L. Lin *et.al.*, Nature **504**, 415418 (2013); G.P. Beretta, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **237**, 012004 (2010); A. Mari and J. Eisert, PRL **108**, 120602 (2012); Luis A. Correa et.al., Scientific Reports **4**, 3949 (2014).
[62] M.N. Bera, T. Qureshi, M.A. Siddiqui, A.K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 012118 (2015).
[63] A. K. Alok, S. Banerjee and S. U. Sankar, arXiv:1411.5536.
[64] T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 210401 (2015).
[65] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
[66] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997).
[67] S. Luo, Proc. of Am. Math. Soc. **132**, 885 (2003).
[68] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 180403 (2003); S. Luo and Q. Zhang, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 032106 (2004).
[69] K. Zyczkowski et al., Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012101 (2001).
[70] S. Daffer, K. Wodkiewicz and J. K. McIver, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 062312 (2003).
[71] I. Chakrabarty, S. Banerjee and N. Siddharth, Quantum Information and Computation **11**, 0541 (2011).
[72] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Optics Communications **283**, 676680 (2010).
[73] R. Kubo, M. Toda and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical Physics II*, Springer, Berlin, 1991.